

# Initial Institutional Approval



# Purpose of Initial Institutional Approval

To ensure that a prospective sponsor is capable of providing effective educator preparation program(s) leading to a California teaching or services credential.

Education Code §44372 (c)

The powers and duties of the Commission include:

Rule on the eligibility of an applicant for accreditation when the applying institution has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California

# Objectives of the Revised IIA Process

- ▶ Strengthen a previously weak system in which the Commission had limited opportunities for input.
- ▶ Strengthen existing requirements and add important new aspects to the system (such as ensuring the security of student records).
- ▶ Provide the Commission with greater flexibility to act to deny or request additional information from institutions seeking to offer educator preparation in California than in the previous system.

# An Interested Entity Contacts Staff

Information is shared on the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) and Initial Program Review (IPR) processes

- ▶ IIA: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/elig-inst-become.html>
- ▶ IPR: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/new-program-submission.html>

# Stage I: Prerequisites

Entity must be one that is eligible to offer educator preparation in California

1. A regionally accredited institution of higher education (IHE)
2. A local education agency (LEA)
3. A CBO or NGO that intends to offer teacher preparation in a STEM field (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-08/2010-08-5B.pdf>)

EC §§ 44227, 44259, 44325, 44227.2



# Stage I: Prerequisites

## Attend Accreditation 101

- ▶ One day training that provides information on educator preparation and accreditation in California
- ▶ Must attend with a team
  - Unit head
  - Fiscal officer
  - Director of proposed program
  - Partner appropriate to type of program (employing organization/IHE)
  - Others that the institution wants to include

Once the entity meets both Prerequisites, the entity may submit to the Eligibility Criteria

# Stage II: Addressing the Eligibility Criteria

- ▶ Entity develops a submission addressing the 12 Eligibility Criteria
- ▶ Submission is reviewed for completeness by staff, agenda item prepared for Commission

Commission determines if the entity has satisfied the eligibility criteria. Three options:

- 1) Eligibility approved
- 2) More Information Requested
- 3) Denied

# Stage II: Addressing the Eligibility Criteria

- ▶ Approval of Eligibility – The entity may move to Stage III and submit Preconditions, Common Standards, and Program Standards
- ▶ Approval of Eligibility does NOT allow them to offer a Commission approved program
- ▶ Denial – Commission should indicate upon which Eligibility criteria the denial was based



# Adopted Eligibility Criteria

1. Responsibility and Authority
2. Mission and Vision
3. Lawful Practices
4. Commission Assurances and Compliance
5. Requests for Data
6. Veracity in all Claims and Documentation Submitted
7. Grievance Process
8. Communication and Information
9. Student Records Management, Access, and Security
10. History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Educator Preparation
11. Capacity and Resources
12. Disclosure

# Stage III: Eligible Entity Addresses Standards

- ▶ Submit evidence of meeting the Program Preconditions. Staff reviews this information.
- ▶ Develops a full narrative response to the Common Standards with supporting documentation. This submission is reviewed by two members of the BIR.
- ▶ Develops a full program proposal for the educator preparation program. Submits the proposal with supporting documentation. This submission is reviewed by two members of the BIR.

# Stage III: Process to Review Standards

Each of these submissions is reviewed with feedback going to the institution and the institution resubmitting additional information until the readers agree that the submission meets all adopted standards.

## Common Standards Review - Institutional Infrastructure

1. Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation
2. Candidate Recruitment and Support
3. Coursework, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice
4. Continuous Improvement
5. Program Impact

# Stage III: Process to Review Standards

## Program Review:

Does the proposed program meet the Commission's adopted standards? Coursework, field work, assessment of candidate competence.

The institution will not be brought back to the Commission until and unless all standards have been addressed and the reviewers find the standards to be met.

## Stage III: Commission Decision

When the Common Standards have been found to be met and the Preconditions satisfied, then the Commission would consider granting Provisional Approval to the entity.

If granted Provisional Approval, the institution must still complete the Initial Program Review (IPR) process before offering an educator preparation program leading to licensure in California.



# Stage III: Completion of IPR

Once the review of the Program proposal is reviewed by members of the BIR and found to be met, and after the Commission grants Provisional Approval, the program approval is considered by the COA.

Only AFTER: 1) Commission grants Provisional Approval and 2) COA approves the Program, may the institution offer the program.

# Stage IV: Provisional Approval

- ▶ Program operates for 2-3 years as determined by the Commission and such that there are program completers
- ▶ No additional programs may be submitted during Provisional Approval
- ▶ The entity must comply with specified accreditation activities including a focused site visit
- ▶ Sponsor collects data on candidate outcomes and program effectiveness during this time

# Stage V: Full Approval

The Commission is presented with information summarizing the data collected on candidate outcomes and program effectiveness, and the results of the site visit team, to make a determination of whether the entity should be granted full approval.

- ▶ If the entity is granted full approval, it will be placed in an accreditation cohort and operate as any other approved institution.
- ▶ If the entity's application for full accreditation is denied, the entity must close its educator preparation program (s). Staff would work with the sponsor to ensure that all candidates are placed appropriately.

# Refining the IIA Procedures

Possible revisions to the process:

- ▶ Reordering the Eligibility Criteria
  - Staff make recommendations on 9 Criteria
  - Commission discuss and decide on 3 Criteria
  - Identify Factors to Consider for the 3 complex criteria
- ▶ Procedures for Requesting Additional Information on a Specific Topic
- ▶ Addressing Questions to the Institution—Process to allow
- ▶ Process when not granting eligibility

# Reordered Eligibility Criteria - Staff Recommends

1. Responsibility and Authority
2. Mission and Vision
3. Lawful Practices
4. Commission Assurances and Compliance
5. Requests for Data
6. Grievance Process
7. Communication and Information
8. Student Records Management, Access, and Security
9. Disclosure



# Reordered Eligibility Criteria - Commission

- 10. Veracity in all Claims and Documentation Submitted
- 11. History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Educator Preparation
- 12. Capacity and Resources

Factors to Consider

# Information on Program, Faculty, or Field Experiences

- ▶ During Stage II Eligibility: Commission could identify specific topics where the body would like to see the institution's information during the third stage, prior to deciding on Provisional Approval.
- ▶ Reviewers would complete the iterative review process and when the proposal has been found to meet the standards the information related to the identified topic would be included in the Commission agenda item when the entity is brought back for Provisional Approval.

# Plan for Addressing Questions for the Institution

Staff suggests that:

- ▶ If the question is very specific or a small clarification, the prospective sponsor could be invited to the table to respond.
- ▶ If there are any questions or concerns, other than a small specific question, the Commission's questions will be provided to the prospective sponsor, who will submit a response for review at a future meeting.

# Process When Not Granting Eligibility

If the Commission decides not to grant Eligibility, the Commissioner making the motion should identify in the motion which of the 12 Eligibility Criteria the proposal does not adequately address.

# Summarizing the Options to Refine Process

Possible revisions to the process:

- ▶ Reordering the Eligibility Criteria
  - Staff make recommendations on 9 Criteria
  - Commission discuss and decide on 3 Criteria
  - Identify Factors to Consider for the 3 complex criteria
- ▶ Procedures for Requesting Additional Information on a Specific Topic
- ▶ Addressing Questions to the Institution - Process to allow
- ▶ Process when not granting eligibility